

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

Status of Claims:

Claims 5, 13 and 16 are currently being cancelled.

Claims 1, 6, 7, 8, 9, 14 and 15 are currently being amended.

Claims 17-19 are currently being added.

This amendment and reply adds, cancels and amends claims in this application. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claims remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

After adding, canceling and amending the claims as set forth above, claims 1-4, 6-12, 14, 15 and 17-19 are now pending in this application.

Claim Rejections – Prior Art:

In the Office Action, claims 1-5, 9-12 and 14-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by EP 1176493 to Pathuel; claims 6 and 7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pathuel in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,904,526 to Hongwei; and claims 8, 13 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pathuel in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,911,777 to Heredia. These rejections are traversed with respect to the presently pending claims under rejection, for at least the reasons given below.

In the Office Action, in its rejection of claims 8, 13 and 16, it utilizes the teachings of Heredia, which is directed to a system for preventing a portable computer from being removed from a docking station by an unauthorized person. See Abstract of Heredia. In particular, in Heredia, a docking station demands a password to be entered in response to an undocking request, whereby the docking station releases and ejects the portable computer only when the password is correctly entered. Column 5, lines 17-21 of Heredia describes that, in response to an ejection request, an operating system invokes an SMI subroutine to determine whether an Ejection Password Protection function is enabled by checking for an ejection password flag 602 which can be stored in a memory address.

Presently pending independent claim 1, which has been amended to include the features of claims 5 and 8 (now canceled), as well as other features directed to a telephone dialing operation, is clearly different from the teachings of Heredia. In particular, as recited in claim 1, when a telephone dialing request operation occurs, the controller searches the database for address information related to a telephone number corresponding to the telephone dialing request operation and, when the password check flag accompanying the address information found indicates that password check is needed, starts an unauthorized use preventing operation to prevent voice communication to be made to the telephone number corresponding to the telephone dialing request operation. Thus, a telephone number dialing operation to an unauthorized telephone number is prevented by use of a password check flag, whereby this is clearly different from preventing a removal of a portable computer from a docking station (whereby no operations on the portable computer are performed by this attempted removal of the portable computer from the docking station).

Accordingly, since Pathuel does not rectify the above-mentioned deficiencies of Heredia (as implicitly acknowledged in the Office Action due its reliance on the combination of Pathuel and Heredia in rejecting claims 8, 13 and 16), presently pending independent claim 1 is patentable over the cited art of record.

Presently pending independent claims 9 and 14 have been amended in a manner similar to the amendments made to presently pending independent claim 1, whereby those claims are also patentable over the cited art of record.

New Claims:

New claims 17-19 have been added to recite additional features of the present invention that are believed to provide an additional basis of patentability for those claims, beyond the reasons given above for their respective base claims.

Conclusion:

Since all of the issues raised in the Office Action have been addressed in this Amendment and Reply, Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance, and an early indication of allowance is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check or credit card payment form being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date October 18, 2007

By Phillip J. Articola

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 22428
Telephone: (202) 945-6014
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

George C. Beck
Registration No. 38,072

Phillip J. Articola
Registration No. 38,819